arXiv:1512.05688v1 [math.AG] 17 Dec 2015

# COUNTING POSITIVE INTERSECTION POINTS OF A TRINOMIAL AND A T-NOMIAL CURVES VIA GROETHENDIECK'S DESSIN D'ENFANT

BOULOS EL HILANY

Abstract. We consider real polynomial systems $f = g = 0$ in two variables where $f$ has $t \geq 3$ monomial terms and $g$ has 3 monomials terms. We prove that the number of positive isolated solutions of such a system does not exceed $3 \cdot 2^{t-2} - 1$. This improves the bound $2^t - 2$ obtained in [11]. This also refines for $t = 4, \ldots, 9$ the bound $2t^3/3 + 5t$ obtained in [10]. Our proof is based on a delicate analysis of the Groethendieck's dessin d'enfant associated to some rational function determined by the system. For $t = 3$, it was shown in [11] that the sharp bound is five, and if this bound is reached, then the Minkowski sum of the associated Newton triangles is an hexagon. A further analysis of Groethendieck's dessin d'enfant allows us to show that if the bound five is reached, then there exist two consecutive edges of the hexagon which are translate of two consecutive edges of one Newton triangle.

## 1. Introduction and Statement of the Main Results

It is common in mathematics to be faced with a system of polynomial equations whose solutions we need to study or to count. Such systems arise frequently in various fields such as control theory [5], kinematics [3], chemistry [7, 12] and many others where it is mainly the real solutions that matter. One of the main questions is the following. Given a polynomial system, what can we say about the number of its real solutions? Polynomial systems that arise naturally may have some special structure (cf. [15]), for instance in terms of disposition of the exponent vectors or their number. However, a great part of this combinatorial data is disregarded when using the degree or mixed volume to bound the number of real solutions, and thus these estimates can be rough. The famous Descartes' rule of signs which implies that the maximal number of positive solutions is $t - 1$, where $t$ is the number of non-zero terms of a univariate polynomial of any degree is an example of how important the number of terms is. A great effort in the study of sparse polynomial systems is to try to find an analogous of the Descarte's rule for a multivariate system. The first such estimation was found by A. Khovanskii in [9] where he proved, among other results, that the number of non-degenerate positive solutions (solutions with positive coordinates) of a system of $n$ polynomials in $n$ variables having a total of $n+k+1$ distinct monomials is bounded above by $2^{\binom{n+k}{2}}(n+1)^{n+k}$. This bound was later improved to be $\frac{e^2+3}{4}2^{\binom{k}{2}}n^k$ by F. Bihan and F. Sottile [2], but still, these estimates are not sharp in general, even in the case of two polynomial equations in two variables.

Real polynomial systems in two variables

$$f = g = 0, \tag{1.1}$$

where $f$ has $t \geq 3$ non-zero terms and $g$ has three non-zero terms have been studied by T.Y. Li, J.-M. Rojas and X. Wang [11]. They showed that such a system, allowing real exponents, has at most $2^t - 2$ isolated positive solutions. The idea is to substitute one variable of the trinomial in

terms of the other, and thus one can reduce the system to an analytic function in one variable

$$h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i x^{k_i} (1-x)^{l_i},$$

where all the coefficients and exponents are real. The number of positive solutions of (1.1) is equal to that of $h = 0$ contained in $]0, 1[$. The main techniques used in [11] are an extension of Rolle's Theorem and a recursion involving derivatives of certain analytic functions. A special case of A. Kuchnirenko's conjecture stated that when $t = 3$, system (1.1) has at most four positive solutions. In an effort to disprove this conjecture, Haas had shown in [8] that

$$10x^{106} + 11y^{53} - 11y = 10y^{106} + 11x^{53} - 11x = 0$$

has five positive solutions. It was later shown in [11] using a case by case analysis that when $t = 3$, the sharp bound on the number of positive solutions is five. Moreover, it was proved in the same paper that if this bound is reached, then the Minkowski sum of the associated Newton polytopes $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ is an hexagon. In terms of normal fans, this means that the normal fan of the Minkowski sum $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$, which is the common refinement of the normal fans of $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$, has six 2-dimensional cones (and six 1-dimensional cones).

A simpler polynomial system

$$x^6 + (44/31)y^3 - y = y^6 + (44/31)x^3 - x = 0 \tag{1.2}$$

that also has five positive solutions was discovered by A. Dickenstein, J.-M. Rojas, K. Rusek and J. Shih [6]. They also showed that such systems are rare in the following sense. They study the discriminant variety of coefficients spaces of polynomial systems (1.2) with fixed exponent vectors, and show that the chambers (connected components of the complement) containing systems with the maximal number of positive solutions are small.

The exponential upper bound $2^t - 2$ on the number of positive solutions of (1.1) has been recently refined by P. Koiran, N. Portier and S. Tavenas [10] into a polynomial one. They considered an analytic function in one variable

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} \prod_{j=1}^{m} f_j^{\alpha_{i,j}} \tag{1.3}$$

where all $f_j$ are real polynomials of degree at most $d$ and all the powers of $f_j$ are real. Using the Wronskian of analytic functions, it was proved that the number of positive roots of (1.3) in an interval $I$ (assuming that $f_j(I) \subset ]0, +\infty[$) is equal to $\frac{t^3md}{3} + 2tmd + t$. As a particular case (taking $m = 2$, $d = 1$ and $I = ]0, 1[$), they obtain that $h(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{t} a_i x^{k_i} (1-x)^{l_i}$ has at most $2t^3/3 + 5t$ roots in $I$.

Throughout this paper, we assume that (1.1) has a finite number of solutions and denote by $\mathcal{S}(3, t)$ its maximal number of positive solutions. We prove the following result in Section 2.

**Theorem 1.1.** *We have* $\mathcal{S}(3, t) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{t-2} - 1$.

In particular, this proves again that the sharp bound on the number of positive solutions of two trinomials is five. Moreover, this new bound is the sharpest known for $t = 4, \ldots, 9$, and shows for example that $6 \leq \mathcal{S}(3, 4) \leq 11$. We study systems (1.1) using the same method as in [11]

i.e. we consider a recursion involving derivatives of analytic functions in one variable. We begin with the function $f_1 = h$ and at each step $1 < i < t$, we are left with a function $f_i$ defined as a certain number of derivatives of $f_{i-1}$ multiplied by a power of $x$ and of $(1-x)$. Using Rolle's Theorem for each $f_i$, one can bound the number of its roots contained in $]0,1[$ in terms of the roots of $f_{i-1}$ in the same interval. It turns out that at the step $t-2$, we are reduced to bound the number of roots in $]0,1[$ of the equation $\phi(x) = 1$, where

$$\phi(x) = \frac{x^\alpha (1-x)^\beta P(x)}{Q(x)},$$

$\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}$, and both $P$ and $Q$ are real polynomials of degree at most $2^{t-2} - 1$. The larger part of this paper is devoted to the proof in Section 3 of the following result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *We have* $\sharp\{x \in ]0,1[ \ | \phi(x) = 1\} \ \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 2$.

Choosing $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that both $m\alpha$ and $m\beta$ are integers, we get a rational function $\varphi := \phi^m : \mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^1$. The inverse images of $0$, $1$, $\infty$ are given by the roots of $P$, $Q$, $\varphi - 1$, together with 0 and 1 (if $\alpha\beta \neq 0$). These inverse images lie on the graph $\Gamma := \varphi^{-1}(\mathbb{R}P^1) \subset \mathbb{C}P^1$, which is an example of a Groethendieck's real *dessin d'enfant* (cf. [1] [4] and [13]). Critical points of $\varphi$ correspond to vertices of $\Gamma$. The number of roots of $\varphi - 1$ in $]0,1[$ is controlled by the number of a certain type of critical points of $\varphi$ called *useful positive* critical points. By doing a delicate analysis on $\Gamma$, we bound the number of vertices corresponding to these critical points in terms of $\deg P$ and $\deg Q$.

We consider in Section 4 the case $t = 3$ i.e. the case of two trinomials in two variables and give more delicate conditions on the Minkowski sum of $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ when the maximal number of positive solutions is attained. We say that $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ alternate if every 2-dimensional cone of the normal fan of $\Delta_1$ contains a 1-dimensional cone of the normal fan of $\Delta_2$ having only the origin as a common face. A further analysis of $\Gamma$ in the case $t = 3$ allows us to obtain the following result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *If the system* (1.1) *has 5 positive solution, then* $\Delta_1$ *and* $\Delta_2$ *do not alternate.*

The Newton triangles $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate means that there exist two consecutive edges of $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$ which are translate of two consecutive edges of either $\Delta_1$ or $\Delta_2$. Figure 1 illustrates this theorem for the system (1.2), and we provide another example in Section 4.



FIGURE 1. The Newton polytopes, their Minkowski sum and the associated normal fans of (1.2).

The author is grateful to Frédéric Bihan for fruitful discussions and guidance.

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Define the polynomials $f$ and $g$ of (1.1) as

$$f(u,v)=\sum_{i=1}^{t}a_iu^{\alpha_i}v^{\beta_i} \quad \text{and} \quad g(u,v)=\sum_{j=1}^{3}b_ju^{\gamma_j}v^{\delta_j}, \tag{2.1}$$

where all $a_i$ and $b_i$ are real.

We suppose that the system (1.1) has positive solutions, thus the coefficients of $g$ have different signs. Therefore without loss of generality, let $b_1=-1$, $b_2>0$ and $b_3>0$. Since we are looking for positive solutions of (1.1) with non-zero coordinates, one can assume that $\gamma_1=\delta_1=0$. Furthermore, the monomial change of coordinates $(u,v)\to(x,y)$ of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ defined by $b_2u^{\gamma_2}v^{\delta_2}=x$ and $b_3u^{\gamma_3}v^{\delta_3}=y$ preserves the number of positive solutions. Therefore, we are reduced to a system

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t}c_ix^{k_i}y^{l_i}=-1+x+y=0 \tag{2.2}$$

where $c_i$ is real for $i=1,\cdots,t$, and all $k_i$ and $l_i$ are rational numbers.

We now look for the positive solutions of (2.2). It is clear that since both $x$ and $y$ are positive, then $x\in]0,1[$. Substituting $1-x$ for $y$ in (2.2), we get

$$F(x):=\sum_{i=1}^{t}c_ix^{k_i}(1-x)^{l_i}, \tag{2.3}$$

so that the number of positive solutions of (1.1) is equal to that of roots of $F$ in $]0,1[$.

For any $d\in\mathbb{N}$, denote by $\mathbb{R}_d[x]$ the set of real polynomials of degree at most $d$.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Consider a function defined by* $h(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{s}b_ix^{m_i}(1-x)^{n_i}h_{i,d}(x)$, *where* $h_{1,d},\dots,h_{s,d}\in\mathbb{R}_d[x]$. *Then for all* $r\in\mathbb{N}$, *there exist* $h_{1,d+r},\dots,h_{s,d+r}\in\mathbb{R}_{d+r}[x]$ *such that the* $r$*-th derivative of* $h$ *is defined by*

$$h^{(r)}(x)=\sum_{i=1}^{s}x^{m_i-r}(1-x)^{n_i-r}h_{i,d+r}(x).$$

*Proof.* One computes that

$$(x^m(1-x)^nh(x))'=x^{m-1}(1-x)^{n-1}\cdot\left[((n-m)x+m)\,h(x)+x(1-x)h'(x)\right].$$

□

Define $f_1,\dots,f_t$ inductively by $f_1(x)=x^{-k_1}(1-x)^{-l_1}F(x)$ and

$$f_{j+1}(x)=x^{k_j-k_{j+1}+2^{j-1}}\cdot(1-x)^{l_j-l_{j+1}+2^{j-1}}\cdot f_j^{(2^{j-1})}(x)\,,\ j=1,\dots,t-1.$$

**Lemma 2.2.** *For $j = 1, \dots, t$, there exist polynomials $h_{j,d_j}, \dots, h_{t,d_j} \in \mathbb{R}_{d_j}[x]$ such that $d_j = 2^{j-1} - 1$,*

$$f_j(x) = h_{j,d_j}(x) + \sum_{i=j+1}^{t} x^{k_i - k_j}(1-x)^{l_i - l_j} h_{i,d_j} \quad \textit{for} \quad j = 1, \dots, t-1 \tag{2.4}$$

*and $f_t = h_{t,d_t}(x)$.*

*Proof.* This follows easily from Lemma 2.1. □

Let $N_j$ denote the set $\sharp\{x \in ]0,1[ \mid f_j(x) = 0\}$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$. Note that $N_1 = \sharp\{x \in ]0,1[ \mid F(x) = 0\}$. Rolle's Theorem implies directly that

$$N_j \leq N_{j+1} + 2^{j-1} \quad \text{for} \quad j = 1, \dots, t-1. \tag{2.5}$$

Moreover, $N_t \leq d_t = 2^{t-1} - 1$ by Lemma 2.2. Consequently, we get

$$\sharp\{x \in ]0,1[ \mid F(x) = 0\} = N_1 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} 2^{j-1} + N_{t-1} = 2^{t-2} - 1 + N_{t-1}. \tag{2.6}$$

By (2.5), we have $N_{t-1} \leq N_t + 2^{t-2} \leq 2^{t-1} - 1 + 2^{t-2}$ (since $N_t \leq 2^{t-1} - 1$), which together with (2.6) gives

$$\sharp\{x \in ]0,1[ \mid F(x) = 0\} \leq 2^t - 2.$$

This is the bound obtained in [11]. The sharper bound that we give is obtained by improving the bound on $N_{t-1}$. This improvement uses the fact that $f_{t-1}$ is a rational function, thus one can use a different approach to get a sharp bound on $N_{t-1}$. We have already seen that

$$f_{t-1}(x) = -Q(x) + x^{k_t - k_{t-1}}(1-x)^{l_t - l_{t-1}} P(x),$$

where $P, Q \in \mathbb{R}_{d_{t-1}}[x]$ with $d_{t-1} = 2^{t-2} - 1$.
We have

$$f_{t-1}(x) = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \frac{x^{k_t - k_{t-1}}(1-x)^{l_t - l_{t-1}} P(x)}{Q(x)} = 1.$$

Therefore applying Theorem 1.2, we get $N_{t-1} \leq 2^{t-1} - 2 + 2 = 2^{t-1}$. Finally, by (2.5), we get

$$\sharp\{x \in ]0,1[ \mid f(x) = 0\} \leq 2^{t-1} + 2^{t-2} - 1 = 3 \cdot 2^{t-2} - 1,$$

which finishes the proof of Theorem 1.1 assuming Theorem 1.2.

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Recall that

$$\phi(x) = \frac{x^\alpha (1-x)^\beta P(x)}{Q(x)},$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}$. Let $m$ be a positive integer such that $m\alpha$ and $m\beta$ are integers. Then $\varphi := \phi^m$ is a rational function from $\mathbb{C}$ to $\mathbb{C}$. Here and in the rest of the paper, we see the source and target spaces of $\varphi$ as the affine charts of $\mathbb{C}P^1$ given by the non-vanishing of the first coordinate of homogeneous coordinates and denote with the same symbol $\varphi$ the rational function from $\mathbb{C}P^1$ to $\mathbb{C}P^1$ obtained by homogenization with respect to these coordinates. In what follows, we apply the theory of Groethendieck's dessin d'enfant to the rational function $\varphi$.

3.1. **Real Dessins D'enfant.** We give now a brief description of real dessins d'enfant. The notations we use are taken from [1] and for other details, see [4, 13] for instance. Define $\Gamma := \varphi^{-1}(\mathbb{R}P^1)$. This is a real graph on $\mathbb{C}P^1$ (invariant with respect to the complex conjugation) and which contains $\mathbb{R}P^1$. Any connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ is homeomorphic to an open disk. Moreover, each vertex of $\Gamma$ has even valency, and the multiplicity of a critical point with real critical value of $\varphi$ is half its valency. The graph $\Gamma$ contains the inverse images of 0, $\infty$ and 1. The inverse image of 0 are the roots of $P$, 0 if $\alpha > 0$ and 1 if $\beta > 0$. The inverse image of $\infty$ are the roots of $Q$, 0 if $\alpha < 0$ and 1 if $\beta < 0$. Denote by the same letter $p$ (resp. $q$ and $r$) the points of $\Gamma$ which are mapped to 0 (resp. $\infty$ and 1). Orient the real axis on the target space via the arrows $0 \to \infty \to 1 \to 0$ (orientation given by the decreasing order in $\mathbb{R}$) and pull back this orientation by $\varphi$. The graph $\Gamma$ becomes an oriented graph, with the orientation given by arrows $p \to q \to r \to p$. The graph $\Gamma$ is called *real dessin d'enfant* associated to $\varphi$. A **cycle** of $\Gamma$ is the boundary of a connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$. Any such cycle contains the same non-zero number of letters $r$, $p$ , $q$ (see Figure 2). We say that a cycle obeys the **cycle rule**.




FIGURE 2. Cycles of a dessin d'enfant.

Conversely, suppose we are given a real connected oriented graph $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}P^1$ that contains $\mathbb{R}P^1$, symmetric with respect to $\mathbb{R}P^1$ and having vertices of even valency, together with a real continuous map $\psi : \Gamma \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}P^1$. Suppose that the boundary of each connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ (which is a disc) contains the same non-zero number of letters $p$, $q$ and $r$ satisfying the cycle rule. Choose coordinates on the target space $\mathbb{C}P^1$. Choose one connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ and send it homeomorphically to one connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$ so that letters $p$ are sent to $(1 : 0)$, letters $q$ are sent to $(0 : 1)$ and letters $r$ to $(1 : 1)$. Do the same for each connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ so that the resulting homeomorphisms extend to an orientation preserving continuous map $\psi : \mathbb{C}P^1 \to \mathbb{C}P^1$. Note that two adjacent connected components of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ are sent to different connected components of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$. The Riemann Uniformization Theorem implies that $\psi$ is a real rational map for the standard complex structure on the target space and its pull-back by $\psi$ on the source space.

Since the graph is invariant under complex conjugation, it is determined by its intersection with one connected component $H$ (for half) of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$. In most figures we will only show one half part $H \cap \Gamma$ together with $\mathbb{R}P^1 = \partial H$ represented as a horizontal line.

**Definition 3.1.** *Any root or pole of $\varphi$ is called a* ***special point*** *(of $\varphi$), and any other point of $\Gamma$ is called* ***non-special****.*

3.2. **Reduction to a simpler case.** We first need a definition.

**Definition 3.2.** *Let $a$, $b$ be two critical points of $\varphi$ i.e. vertices of $\Gamma$. We say that $a$ and $b$ are* ***neighbors*** *if there is a branch of $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$ joining them such that this branch does not contain any special or critical points of $\varphi$ other than $a$ or $b$.*

In this section, we show how to reduce to the case where $\varphi$ satisfies the following properties

$$\begin{aligned} &\textbf{(i)} && \text{All roots of } P \text{ and } Q \text{ are special points of } \varphi \text{ with the same multiplicity } m. \\ &\textbf{(ii)} && \text{Each non-special critical point of } \varphi \text{ has multiplicity two and is not} \\ & && \text{a solution of } \varphi = 1. \\ &\textbf{(iii)} && \text{All } \textit{real} \text{ non-special critical points of } \varphi \text{ are neighbors to } \textit{real} \text{ critical} \\ & && \text{points of } \varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

We will introduce an algorithm that transforms any dessin d'enfant $\Gamma$ of $\varphi$ to a dessin d'enfant $\Gamma'$ of a function satisfying the three properties mentioned above. Moreover, this transformation does not reduce the number of *real* letters $r$ of $\varphi$. Therefore, to prove Theorem 1.2, it suffices to consider a function $\varphi$ satisfying (3.1).

This algorithm is a series of transformations which are devided into two types. The first type, called type (I), reduces the valencies of all critical points so they verify the conditions **(i)** and **(ii)**. The second type, called type (II), transforms a couple of conjugate points $p$ (resp. $q$, $r$, non-special critical points) into a point $p$ (resp. $q$, $r$, non-special critical point) which belongs to $\mathbb{R}P^1$.

3.2.1. *Transformation of type (I).* Consider a critical point $\alpha$ of $\varphi$, which does not belong to $\{0, 1, \infty\}$.

• Assume that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}P^1$. Let $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ be a small neighborhood of $\alpha$ in $\mathbb{C}P^1$ such that $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \setminus \{\alpha\}$ does not contain letters $r$, critical points or special points.

Assume that $\alpha$ is a special point (a root or a pole of $\varphi$). Then the valency of $\alpha$ is equal to $2km$ for some natural number $k$. We transform the graph $\Gamma$ inside $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ as in Figure 3. In the new graph $\Gamma'$, the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ contains two real special points and a real non-special critical point of $\varphi$ (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ and vertices). If $\alpha$ is a root (resp. pole) of $\varphi$ then both special points are roots (resp. poles) of $\varphi$ with multiplicities $m$ and $(k-1)m$. Moreover, the new non-special critical point has multiplicity 2. It is obvious that the resulting graph $\Gamma'$ is still a real dessin d'enfant.

Assume that $\alpha$ is a non-special critical point that is a letter $r$ (a root of $\varphi - 1$). Then the valency of $\alpha$ is equal to $2k$ for some natural number $k \geq 2$. We transform the graph $\Gamma$ as in Figure 4. In the new graph $\Gamma'$, the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ contains two letters $r$ of multiplicity $2(k-1)$ and 1 respectively, and one non-special critical point of multiplicity 2, which is not a letter $r$ (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or vertices).

Assume that $\alpha$ is a non-special critical point that is *not* a letter $r$. Then the valency of $\alpha$ is equal to $2k$ for some natural number $k \geq 3$. We transform the graph $\Gamma$ such that in the new graph $\Gamma'$, the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ contains two non-special critical points, which are not letters $r$, with multiplicities 2 and $(k-1)$ (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or vertices).

• Assume now that $\alpha \notin \mathbb{R}P^1$. Consider a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ of $\alpha$ and the corresponding neighborhood of its conjugate $\bar{\alpha}$ (the image of $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ by the complex conjugation). Assume that




FIGURE 3. A transformation of type (I) where $\alpha$ is a real root of $P$, $k = 3$ and $m = 4$.

both neighborhoods are disjoint and both $\mathcal{U}_\alpha \setminus \{\alpha\}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\bar{\alpha}} \setminus \{\bar{\alpha}\}$ do not contain letters $r$, critical points or special points. Recall that the valency of $\alpha$ is even. Choose two branches of $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ starting from $\alpha$ such that the complement of these two branches in $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ has two connected components containing the same number of branches of $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{U}_\alpha$. We transform $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ similarly as in the case $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}P^1$ and do the corresponding transformation of the image of $\Gamma \cap \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ by the complex conjugation.

Assume that $\alpha$ is a special point (a root or a pole of $\varphi$). We transform the graph $\Gamma$ inside $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ as in Figure 5. In $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$, the resulting graph $\Gamma'$ contains two special points of $\varphi$ with multiplicities $m$ and $(k-1)m$ respectively, and one non-special critical point with multiplicity 2 (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or vertices), all of which belong to the previously chosen two branches.

Assume that $\alpha$ is a non-special critical point that is a letter $r$ (a root of $\varphi - 1$). Then the valency of $\alpha$ is equal to $2k$ for some natural number $k \geq 2$. In the new graph $\Gamma'$, the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ contains two letters $r$ of multiplicity $2(k-1)$ and 1 respectively, and one non-special critical point of multiplicity 2, which is not a letter $r$ (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or vertices), all of which belong to the previously chosen branches.

Assume that $\alpha$ is a non-special critical point that is *not* a letter $r$. Then the valency of $\alpha$ is equal to $2k$ for some natural number $k \geq 3$. We transform the graph $\Gamma$ such that in the new graph $\Gamma'$, the neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ contains two non-special critical points, which are not letters $r$ and which belong to the previously chosen two branches, with multiplicities 2 and $(k-1)$ respectively (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or vertices).

We make this type of transformation to every point $\alpha$ mentioned before. Repeating this process several times gives eventually the conditions **(i)** and **(ii)**.




FIGURE 4. A transformation of type (I) where $\alpha$ is a real root of $\varphi - 1$ with multiplicity 5.

3.2.2. *Transformation of type (II).* Consider a point $\alpha \in \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{R}P^1$, which is either a letter $p$, $q$, $r$ or a non-special critical point, together with its conjugate $\bar{\alpha}$. Note that we do not assume that $\alpha$ is a vertex of $\Gamma$. Assume that $\alpha$ and $\bar{\alpha}$ are both joined by a branch of $\Gamma$ to a real non-special critical point $c$ of multiplicity 2. Assume furthermore that both branches do not contain letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or non-special critical points (if $\alpha$ is a vertex of $\Gamma$, this means that $\alpha$ and $c$ are neighbors), and that $c$ is not a root of $\varphi - 1$. Define $e$ (resp. $\bar{e}$) to be the complex edges joining $\alpha$ (resp. $\bar{\alpha}$) to $c$. Consider a small neighborhood $\mathcal{U}_c$ of $c$ such that $\mathcal{U}_c$ contains both $\alpha$ and $\bar{\alpha}$. Moreover, assume that $\mathcal{U}_c$ does not contain letters $r$, special points or critical points different from $\alpha$, $\bar{\alpha}$ and $c$. We transform $\Gamma$ into a graph $\Gamma'$ as in the Figure 6. In $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$, the new graph $\Gamma'$ contains only one vertex $\beta$, which is a letter $p$ (resp. $q$, $r$, non-special critical point) if so is $\alpha$ (and no other letters $p$, $q$, $r$ or vertices). Moreover, the valency of $\beta$ is equal to two times that of $\alpha$.

3.2.3. *The Algorithm.* The algorithm goes as follows. We achieve conditions **(i)** and **(ii)** first by making transformations of type (I). If there is no $\alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$ as in Section 3.2.2, then the condition **(iii)** is also satified, and we are done. Otherwise, we perform the transformation of type (II), this creates one critical point which violates at least one of conditions **(i)** or **(ii)**. Then, we perform a transformation of type (I) around this real critical point. Repeating this process sufficiently many times gives us eventually conditions **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)**.

3.3. **Analysis of Dessin D'enfant.** In what follows of this section, we assume that $\varphi$ satisfies conditions **(i)**, **(ii)** and **(iii)**.

**Definitions and Notations 3.3.** *Define* $I_0 := ]0,1[$*, and denote by the same letter* $p_0$ *(resp.* $q_0$*) any root (resp. pole) of* $\phi_{|I_0}$*, and by* $p_1$ *(resp.* $q_1$*) any root (resp. pole) of* $\phi_{|I_0^{\complement}}$*, where* $I_0^{\complement} := \mathbb{R} \setminus I_0$*.*




FIGURE 5. A transformation of type (I) where $\alpha$ is a complex root of $Q$, $k = 3$ and $m = 2$.




FIGURE 6. A transformation of type (II) where $\alpha$ is a letter $p$, and $m = 4$ .

*Define* $\flat$ *as the number of connected components of the graph of* $\phi_{|I_0}$*, and* $\flat_+$ *as the number of connected components of the graph of* $\phi_{|I_0}$ *situated above the* $x$*-axis.*

**Remark 3.4.** *Note that the functions* $\phi$ *and* $\varphi = \phi^m$ *have the same* $\flat$ *but not necessarily same* $\flat_+$.

Let $S_0$ be the total number of roots and poles of $\phi_{|I_0}$.

**Lemma 3.5.** *We have* $\lfloor \frac{S_0}{2} \rfloor \leq \flat_+ \leq \lfloor \frac{S_0}{2} \rfloor + 1$.

*Proof.* The roots and poles in $I_0$ of $\phi$ are simple, so the sign of $\phi$ changes when passing through one of them. □

**Remark 3.6.** *If $S_0$ is even and $\flat_+ = \frac{|S_0|}{2} + 1$, then the closest branch to 0 (resp. to 1) of the graph of $\phi$ in $I_0$ is above the $x$-axis.*

Note that

$$\phi'(x) = \frac{x^{\alpha-1}(1-x)^{\beta-1}H(x)}{Q^2(x)}$$

where $H(x)$ is

$$\alpha P(x)Q(x) + (P'(x)Q(x) - P(x)Q'(x) - (\alpha+\beta)P(x)Q(x))x + (P(x)Q'(x) - P'(x)Q(x))x^2,$$

and thus $\deg H \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 1$. Therefore, since we assumed that all non-special critical points of $\phi$ are of multiplicity two, the polynomial $H$ has at most $\deg P + \deg Q + 1$ simple roots. One easily computes that $\phi$ and $\varphi = \phi^m$ have the same set $E$ of non-special critical points (recall that $|E| \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 1$). Moreover, $\phi^{(k)}(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow (\phi^m)^{(k)}(x) = 0$. Hence a critical point of $\phi$ with non-zero critical value is a critical point of $\varphi$ with also non-zero critical value and same multiplicity, and vice versa. Note that if $x$ is a root (simple by assumption) of $P$ (resp. $Q$), then $x$ is a special point of $\phi^m$ of multiplicity $m$, thus corresponds to a vertex of $\Gamma = (\phi^m)^{-1}(\mathbb{R}P^1)$ of valency $2m$.
Set $B = (\phi^{-1}(0,1,\infty) \cup \{ \text{ non-special critical points } \}) \cap \mathbb{R}$.

**Definition 3.7.** *A real non-special critical point $n$ is called **useful** if among the two closest points in $B$, there is a letter $r$ (See Figure 7).*




FIGURE 7. $n$ is a useful non-special critical point.

**Definition 3.8.** *Consider two real non-special critical points $x_1$ and $x_2$ in $I_0$ which are neighbors and such that $]x_1, x_2[$ does not contain non-special critical points. Furthermore, consider the disc $\mathcal{D}$ in $\mathbb{C}P^1$ containing $]x_1, x_2[$ with boundary given by the union of the complex arc of $\Gamma$ joining $x_1$ to $x_2$ and its conjugate. Then the **flattening** of $\Gamma$ with respect to $]x_1, x_2[$ is the dessin d'enfant obtained by collapsing the complex conjugate branches joining $x_1$ and $x_2$ to $]x_1, x_2[$ and forgetting all the connected components of $\Gamma$ contained in $\mathcal{D}$. If there is a letter $r$ in the boundary of $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$, then this letter and its conjugate are transformed into a single letter $r \in ]x_1, x_2[$ (see Figure 8).*

Recall that all non-special critical points of $\phi$ have multiplicity two. In particular, if it is real, such a point has only one neighbor.




FIGURE 8. Flattening for $m = 2$.




FIGURE 9. In this example, $m = 1$ and $[x_1, x_2]$ contains three useful non-special critical points, four roots and four poles of $\varphi$.

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let $x_1$, $x_2 \in I_0 = ]0, 1[$ be two non-special critical points which are neighbors. Assume that all non-special critical points in $]x_1, x_2[$ are neighbors only to each other. Then the*

*number of roots of $\varphi$ is equal to that of the poles of $\varphi$ in $]x_1, x_2[$, and this number is bigger than or equal to the number of useful critical points in $[x_1, x_2]$ (See Figure 9).*

*Proof.* Suppose first that $]x_1, x_2[$ does not contain non-special critical points. Then the number of roots (letters $p$) and poles (letters $q$) in $]x_1, x_2[$ are equal by the cycle rule (See Figure 10).




FIGURE 10. $\varphi$ has the same number of roots and poles in $]x_1, x_2[$.

Moreover, $x_1$ and $x_2$ cannot both be useful non-special critical points, again since otherwise this contradicts the cycle rule.




FIGURE 11. Having both non-special critical points useful contradicts the cycle rule.

Assume now that $]x_1, x_2[$ contains non-special critical points.
Consider two non-special critical points $y_1$, $y_2 \in [x_1, x_2]$ which are neighbors and such that $]y_1, y_2[$ does not contain non-special critical points. We have already seen that $y_1$ and $y_2$ cannot both be useful, and that $]y_1, y_2[$ contains the same non-zero number of letters $p$ and $q$.
Thus it suffices to prove the result for the dessin d'enfant obtained by flattening $\Gamma$ with respect to $]y_1, y_2[$.
Note that the number of non-special critical points in $]x_1, x_2[$ strictly decreases after such flattening. Therefore, we are reduced to the case where $]x_1, x_2[$ does not contain non-special critical points.

□

Recall that all letters $p$ and $q$, which are different from 0, 1 or $\infty$, have the same valency $2m$.

**Lemma 3.10.** *Let $x_1$, $x_2 \in I_0$ be critical points which are neighbors and such that $]x_1, x_2[$ does not contain non-special critical points. If one endpoint of $[x_1, x_2]$ is a non-special critical point, then both $x_1$, $x_2$ are non-special critical points.*




FIGURE 12. An impossible configuration given both critical points are in $I_0$.

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction. Assume that $]x_1, x_2[=]\tilde{p}, c[$ where $c$ is a non-special critical point and $\tilde{p}$ is a root of $P$ (the case where instead of $\tilde{p}$ we have a root of $Q$ is symmetric). Consider the open disk $\mathcal{D}$ which contains $]\tilde{p}, c[$ and which is bounded by the complex branch of $\Gamma$ joining $\tilde{p}$ to $c$ together with the conjugate branch. Consider the set of special points in $\mathcal{D} \cup \{\tilde{p}\}$ together with the branches of $\Gamma \cap (\mathcal{D} \cup \tilde{p})$ joining letters $p$ to letters $q$ and not containing any other special points (a branch of $\Gamma$ is a subset homeomorphic to an interval). This gives a bipartite graph $\mathfrak{G}$. Therefore, the total degree of letters $p$ and the total degree of letters $q$ in $\mathfrak{G}$ are equal. Denote by $N_p$ (resp. $N_q$) the number of letters $p$ (resp. letters $q$) contained in $\mathcal{D} \cup \{\tilde{p}\}$. Since $\mathfrak{G}$ is a bipartite graph, we have

$$2mN_q = 2m(N_p - 1) + \deg \tilde{p},$$

where $\deg \tilde{p} \leq 2m - 2$. Therefore $2m(N_p - N_q) = 2m - \deg \tilde{p}$, which is impossible. Indeed, $|2m(N_p - N_q)|$ is either zero or greater than or equal to $2m$, which is not the case for $|2m - \deg \tilde{p}|$. □

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let $\alpha$ be a non-special critical point in $I_0$, and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ be its neighbor. If $\beta$ is a root (letter $p$) or a pole (letter $q$) of $\varphi$, then $\beta \notin I_0$.*

*Proof.* Assume that $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a root of $\varphi$ (a letter $p$), and let us prove that $\beta \notin I_0$ (the case where $\beta$ is a pole of $\varphi$ is symmetric). Performing flattening if necessary, we may suppose that the remaining non-special critical points in $[\alpha, \beta]$ are neighbors to special critical points in $[\alpha, \beta]$. Indeed, since non-special critical points cannot be neighbors to complex special critical points. Consider an open interval $J \subset [\alpha, \beta]$ with endpoints a non-special critical point and a special critical point which are neighbors, and such that $J$ does not contain non-special critical points. Note that if $]\alpha, \beta[$ does not contain non-special critical points, then it suffices to consider $J = ]\alpha, \beta[$. If $\beta \in I_0$, then the existence of $J$ contradicts Lemma 3.10.

□

By definition, useful critical points of $\varphi$ have positive critical value. However, when $m$ is even, some of the non-special useful critical points of $\varphi = \phi^m$ may correspond to non-special critical points of $\phi$ with negative critical value.

**Definition 3.12.** *A useful critical point $x$ of $\varphi = \phi^m$ is called **positive** if $\phi(x) > 0$.*

These useful positive critical points of $\phi^m$ will later play a key role via the following Lemma.

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let $U$ be the set of useful positive non-special critical points in $I_0$ and let $N$ be the number of solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $I_0$. Then $N \leq \flat_+ + |U|$.*

*Proof.* Let $C$ be a connected component of the graph of $\phi_{|I_0}$ situated above the $x$-axis. Let $I \subset I_0$ be the image of $C$ under the vertical projection. It suffices to prove that in $I$, the number

of solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ is bounded above by one plus the number of useful positive critical points.

If this number of solutions is zero or one, the bound is trivial. Otherwise, between two consecutive solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $I$, there is at least one useful positive critical point by Rolle's Theorem.

□

In what follows, by $p_1$ (resp. $q_1$) we mean any real root (resp. pole) of $\varphi$ outside $]0, 1[$.

**Lemma 3.14.** *Let $u_0$ and $v_0$ be two non-special critical points in $I_0$ which are neighbors of the same point $p_1$ (resp. $q_1$). Then the number of useful positive critical points of $\varphi$, contained in $[u_0, v_0]$, is less than or equal to one plus half of the total number of roots (letters $p$) and poles (letters $q$) of $\varphi$ in $]u_0, v_0[$.*

*Proof.* We only prove the result for the point $p_1$ (the case for $q_1$ is symmetric). If there is no non-special critical points inside $]u_0, v_0[$, then the result is clear by the cycle rule (see Figure 13).




FIGURE 13.

Using Proposition 3.9 and flattenings of $\Gamma$ if necessary, we may assume that $[u_0, v_0]$ does not contain non-special critical points that are neighbors. Then, by Lemma 3.11, the remaining non-special critical points in $[u_0, v_0]$ are neighbors to $p_1$. Indeed, by condition **(iii)** of (3.1), real non-special critical points cannot be neighbors to complex special points. The cycle rule implies that between two consecutive non-special critical points in $[u_0, v_0]$, the total number of special points (letters $p$, $q$) is odd. It follows that $\phi$ takes values of opposite signs at two consecutive non-special critical points in $[u_0, v_0]$. The result follows then as any interval with endpoints two consecutive non-special critical points contains at least one special point. □

**Lemma 3.15.** *Assume that $p_1$ (resp. $q_1$) $\in \{0, 1\}$, and let $c$ be the nearest non-special critical point in $I_0$ to $p_1$ (resp. $q_1$) such that $c$ and $p_1$ (resp. $c$ and $q_1$) are neighbors. Then in the open interval $I$ with endpoints $c$ and $p_1$ (resp. $c$ and $q_1$), the number of poles (resp. roots) is equal to the number of roots (resp. poles) plus one.*

*Proof.* We only prove the case for $p_1$ since the case for $q_1$ is symmetric. By Proposition 3.9, we only count the remaining special points in $I$ after flattenning $\Gamma$ with respect to all non-special critical points in $I$ which are neighbors. Note that by Lemma 3.11 and condition **(iii)** of (3.1), there do not exist non-special critical points in $I$ after this flattening. Therefore there should be one root between two consecutive poles of $\phi$ and vice-versa in $I$. Finally, by the cycle rule, the nearest special points to $c$ and to $p_1$ in $I$ should both be letters $q$. □

We now categorize the non-special critical points in $I_0$ and the special critical points in $\mathbb{R}$.

**Definition 3.16.** *We first divide the set $S_1$ of special points outside $I_0$ in three disjoint subsets:*

• *$S_{1,0}$ (resp. $S_{1,1}$ , $S_{1,2}$) is the set of special points in $\mathbb{R}\backslash I_0$ which have no (resp. exactly one, at least two) non-special critical points in $I_0$ as neighbors.*

*Similarly, we divide the set $S_0$ of special points in $I_0$ into three disjoint subsets:*

• *$S_{0,0}$ is the set of special points in $I_0$ which are situated between two non-special critical points in $I_0$ that are neighbors. Note that the points of $S_{0,0}$ are those of $S_0$ which disappear after flattenings.*

• *$S_{0,2}$ is the set of special points in $I_0$ which are not in $S_{0,0}$ and which are contained in an interval with two non-special useful critical points that are neighbors of a same point in $S_{1,2}$ (see Figure 14).*




FIGURE 14. A point $q \in S_{1,2}$ and its neighbors: $p_1 \in S_{0,2}$ and two useful critical points $c_1$ and $c_2$.

• $S_{0,1} := S_0\backslash(S_{0,0} \cup S_{0,2})$.

*Finally, the set $U$ of useful positive critical points in $I_0$, is divided as follows:*
• *$US_{1,1}$ (resp. $US_{1,2}$) is the set of useful positive critical points in $I_0$ that are neighbors to points of $S_{1,1}$ (resp. $S_{1,2}$).*

• *$UN_0$ (resp. $UN_1$) is the set of useful positive critical points in $I_0$ that are neighbors to non-special critical points in $I_0$ (resp. outside $I_0$).*

**Remark 3.17.** *Note that by definition, we have $|US_{1,1}| \leq |S_{1,1}|$.*

**Proposition 3.18.** *We have $|US_{1,2}| \leq \frac{|S_{0,2}|}{2} + |S_{1,2}|$ and $|UN_0| \leq \frac{|S_{0,0}|}{2}$.*

*Proof.* Let us prove the first inequality. Doing flattenings if necessary we may assume that $S_{0,0} = 0$. Then $|US_{1,2}| \leq \frac{|S_{0,2}|}{2} + |S_{1,2}|$ follows directly from Lemma 3.14 applied to each point of $S_{1,2}$ together with the biggest interval $[u_0, v_0]$ such that $u_0$ and $v_0$ are non-special critical points which are neighbors to this point in $S_{1,2}$ (see Figure 15).




FIGURE 15. There exist elements of $S_{0,2}$ contained in each of $I_1$ and $I_2$.

Let us now prove that $|UN_0| \leq \dfrac{|S_{0,0}|}{2}$. For each point $c \in UN_0$, consider its neighbor $\tilde{c}$ in $I_0$ ($\tilde{c}$ is a non-special critical point). By Lemma 3.11 and condition **(iii)** of (3.1), the non-special critical points of $\varphi$ between $c$ and $\tilde{c}$ are only neighbors to each other. Applying Proposition 3.9 to each such interval $[\tilde{c}, c]$ (or $[c, \tilde{c}]$) which is maximal in the sense that it is not contained in another interval of the same type (with endpoints a useful positive critical point and a non-special critical point in $I_0$ which are neighbors), we get $|UN_0| \leq \dfrac{|S_{0,0}|}{2}$. □

**Definition 3.19.** *Let $\Gamma$ be a dessin d'enfant and $x \in \Gamma \cap \mathbb{R}P^1$. A **blowing up** of $\Gamma$ at $x$ is the new real dessin d'enfant obtained by adding a small circle $C$ in $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ (together with its conjugate $\overline{C}$) which contains $x$, does not intersect $\Gamma \setminus \{x\}$, and contains letters $p$, $q$, $r$ on $C \setminus \{x\}$ such that the cycle rule holds for $C$ and its conjugate (see Figure 16). A **blowing down** of a dessin d'enfant is the inverse operation.*




FIGURE 16.

**Lemma 3.20.** *Let $D$ be a connected component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \Gamma$ such that its boundary $\partial D$ contains at least one real non-special critical point. Then $\partial D$ contains at least two real special points.*

*Proof.* Consider a connected component of $\partial D \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$ as in the statement, doing as many blowing-downs as necessary, we may assume that for each connected component $C$ of $\partial D \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$, we have that $|\partial C| = 2$. Note that $\partial C \subset \mathbb{R}P^1$. Now, by the cycle rule, $\partial D$ contains at least two special points. If two such special points are real, then we are done. Otherwise, there exists a connected component $C$ of $\partial D \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$ containing a special point of $\varphi$. Now from condition **(iii)** of (3.1), we get that both points of $\partial C$ are special.

□

Recall that we denote by $H\Gamma$ the union of $\mathbb{R}P^1$ and the intersection of $\Gamma$ with one component of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \mathbb{R}P^1$.

**Definition 3.21.** *For any $c \in UN_1$ denote by $\tilde{c}$ its neighbor (a non-special critical point outside $I_0$) and consider the two connected components of $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus H\Gamma$ having the complex arc of $H\Gamma$*

*joining $c$ to $\tilde{c}$ contained in their boundaries. We will call both boundaries* ***associated cycles*** *to $c$.*




FIGURE 17. The associated cycles to $c$.

**Lemma 3.22.** *We have $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}|$. Moreover, denoting by $k$ the number of elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$ which are not contained in cycles associated to some points of $UN_1$, we have $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - k$. Finally, $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - k$ only if any such cycle contains at most two elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$.*

*Proof.* Performing flattening if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $|S_{0,0}| = 0$. We now show that each cycle $\partial D$ associated to some $c \in UN_1$ contains at least one element of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$. Recall that by Lemma 3.20, $\partial D$ contains at least two real special points. We distinguish two cases.

• Assume that $\partial D \cap S_{1,1} \neq \emptyset$. Then by the cycle rule, we get that $\partial D$ also contains at least one letter $r$ (which can be complex) and additional real special points. It is easy to see that none of these additional points belongs to $S_{1,1} \cup S_{1,2}$ (see Figure 18). Therefore, $\partial D$ contains at least one element of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$.




FIGURE 18. The indexes of the letters correspond to those of the sets that contain them. The letter $q_{0,1}$, which is on the left, belongs to one of the associated cycles.

• Assume now that $\partial D$ contains an element of $S_{1,2}$. Then one of the neighbors of this element, which belongs to $\partial D \cap I_0$, is either an element of $S_{0,1}$ or a non-special critical point in $I_0$. In both cases, reasoning as before, we still obtain that $\partial D$ contains at least one element of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$.




FIGURE 19. The left $q_{0,1}$ is a critical point in the cycle.

We now divide $I_0$ with respect to the non-special critical points of $\varphi$. Let

$$c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_N$$

be the non-special critical points of $\varphi$ in $I_0$. Consider two consecutive non-special critical points $c_i$ and $c_{i+1}$.

Assume first that $c_i$ and $c_{i+1}$ belong to $UN_1$. We show that $]c_i, c_{i+1}[\cup]\tilde{c}_{i+1}, \tilde{c}_i[$, where $\tilde{c}_i$ (resp. $\tilde{c}_{i+1}$) is the neighbor of $c_i$ (resp. $c_{i+1}$), contains at least two elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$. Note that $\tilde{c}_i$ and $\tilde{c}_{i+1}$ are non-special critical points outside $I_0$.

It is easy to see that $]\tilde{c}_{i+1}, \tilde{c}_i[\cap(S_{1,1} \cup S_{1,2}) = \emptyset$. Indeed,$]c_i, c_{i+1}[$ does not contain non-special critical points. Therefore the only special points that can be contained in $]c_i, c_{i+1}[\cup]\tilde{c}_{i+1}, \tilde{c}_i[$ are elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$, where by Lemma 3.20, there are at least two of them.

Assume now that only one point, say $c_i$, among $c_i$ and $c_{i+1}$ belongs to $UN_1$. Then the beginning of the proof shows that the cycle associated to $c_i$ which intersects $[c_i, c_{i+1}]$ contains at least one element of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$.

Using again the begining of the proof, we get that the cycle associated to $c_1$ (resp. $c_N$) intersecting $[0, c_1]$ (resp. $[c_N, 1]$), contains at least one element of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$.

Summing all these inequalities (there is no overcounting), we get $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}|$. Furthermore, note that while making this sum, we only consider the points in $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$ that are contained in the cycles associated to points $c \in UN_1$. Therefore, other points in $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$ do not contribute to the sum. Denoting their number by $k$, we get $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - k$. Finally, it is clear from the proof that if $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - k$, then any such cycle contains at most two elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$. □

3.4. **End of the proof of Theorem 1.2.** By Lemma 3.5, Remark 3.17, Proposition 3.18 and Lemma 3.22, we have respectively

$$\text{(3.2)} \qquad \flat_+ \leq \frac{|S_0|}{2} + 1,\ |US_{1,1}| \leq |S_{1,1}|,\ |US_{1,2}| \leq \frac{|S_{0,2}|}{2} + |S_{1,2}|,\ |UN_0| \leq \frac{|S_{0,0}|}{2}$$

$$\text{and} \quad |UN_1| \leq \frac{|S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}|}{2}.$$

Moreover, we have $N \leq \flat_+ + |U|$ by Lemma 3.13. Denote by $S_c$ the set of all complex special points of $\varphi$.

Note that a root (letter $p$) or a pole (letter $q$) of $\varphi$ can have the value at $\infty$. Therefore, $|S_0| + |S_1| \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 3 - |S_c|$.
Thus, since $|U| = |UN_0| + |UN_1| + |US_{1,1}| + |US_{1,2}|$, $|S_0| = |S_{0,0}| + |S_{0,1}| + |S_{0,2}|$ and $|S_1| = |S_{1,0}| + |S_{1,1}| + |S_{1,2}|$, we get

$$N \leq |S_0| + |S_1| + 1 - \frac{|S_{1,0}|}{2} - |S_c| \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 4 - \frac{|S_{1,0}|}{2} - |S_c|. \tag{3.3}$$

If $|S_{1,0}| > 2$ or $|S_c| > 1$, then by (3.3) we have $N \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 2$ and we are done. Note that $|S_c|$ is even since $S_c$ is the set of complex points together with their conjugates. Therefore, let us assume that $|S_{1,0}| \leq 2$ and $|S_c| = 0$. The last equality means that all special points are real and simple.

• Assume that $|S_{1,0}| = 0$. This means that all special points outside $I_0$ (including 0 and 1) are critical and are neighbors to non-special critical points in $I_0$. Consider the open interval $J_0$ (resp. $J_1$) with endpoints the special point 0 (resp. 1) and a neighbor $c_0$ (resp. $c_1$) in $I_0$ (see Figure 20). As a consequence of Lemma 3.15, there exists an odd number of special points in $J_0$ (resp. $J_1$). Note that these special points are elements of $S_{0,1}$, and they cannot be contained in any cycle associated to some $c \in UN_1$. Thus, by Lemma 3.22, we have $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 2$, and therefore we get $N \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 3$.




FIGURE 20.

We now assume that $N = \deg P + \deg Q + 3$ and prove that this gives a contradiction. Then $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 2$ and all inequalities in (3.2) and (3.3) are equalities. In particular, $|S_0|$ is an even number. Then by Remark 3.6 and the fact that there is an odd number of special points in $J_0$ (resp. $J_1$), we get that $c_0$ (resp. $c_1$) is not a positive useful critical point.

This implies that 0 and 1 do not belong to $S_{1,1}$ (and thus belong to $S_{1,2}$). Indeed, suppose on the contrary that one of 0 or 1, say 0, belongs to $S_{1,1}$. Since $c_0$ does not belong to $US_{1,1}$, this implies that $|US_{1,1}| < |S_{1,1}|$, a contradiction.

Now, from $0, 1 \in S_{1,2}$ it follows that $c_0, c_1 \in US_{1,2}$. Denote by $\tilde{c}_0 \in I_0$ the closest non-special critical point to 1 such that $\tilde{c}_0$ is a neighbor to 0, and by $K$ the closed interval with endpoints $c_0$ and $\tilde{c}_0$. Recall that

$$|US_{1,2}| = \frac{|S_{0,2}|}{2} + |S_{1,2}|, \tag{3.4}$$

thus by Lemma 3.14, the number of elements in $K \cap US_{1,2}$ is equal to one plus half the number of elements in $K \cap S_{0,2}$. As $c_0$ is not a positive useful non-special critical point, if $\tilde{c}_0$ is

positive (resp. negative), then $|K \cap S_{0,2}|$ is an odd (resp. even) number, and in both cases we get $|K \cap US_{1,2}|$ is less than one plus half the number of elements in $K \cap S_{0,2}$. This contradicts (3.4).

• Assume that $|S_{1,0}| = 1$. This means that there exists only one special point outside $I_0$ that is not a neighbor to a non-special critical point in $I_0$. We argue now as in the case $|S_{1,0}| = 0$. We have that at least one special point in $\{0, 1\}$, say 0, is a neighbor to a non-special critical point $c_0$ in $I_0$. Then, the interval $J_0 = ]0, c_0[$ contains at least one element of $S_{0,1}$ that is not contained in a cycle associated to some point $c \in UN_1$. Thus by Lemma 3.22, we get $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 1$, and therefore $N \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 3$.

Assume that neither 0 nor 1 belongs to $S_{1,0}$. Then, as discussed in the previous case, since the points 0 and 1 are neighbors to non-special critical points in $I_0$, we get that at least two elements of $S_{0,1}$ (one in $J_0$, another one in $J_1$, see Fig. 20) are not contained in a cycle associated to some $c \in UN_1$. Therefore by Lemma 3.22, we get $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 2$, which yields $N < \deg P + \deg Q + 3$ and we are done.

Assume now that either 0 or 1 belongs to $S_{1,0}$. We assume furthermore that $N = \deg P + \deg Q + 3$ and prove that this gives a contradiction. Using $|S_{1,0}| = 1$, $2|UN_1| \leq |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 1$, $N = \deg P + \deg Q + 3$ and (3.3), we get $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 1$ and $|S_0|$ is even. Consider without loss of generality that $0 \in S_{1,0}$. We have $0 \in S_{1,0} \cap \partial D_0$, where $\partial D_0$ is a cycle associated to some $c_0 \in UN_1$. Indeed, suppose on the contrary that 0 is not contained in a cycle associated to some point $c \in UN_1$. We already saw that there exists an element of $S_{0,1}$ which is not contained in a cycle associated to some $c \in UN_1$. Together with 0 this would give at least two elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$ that are not contained in such a cycle, and thus $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 2$ by Lemma 3.22. This contradicts $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 1$. Therefore $0 \in S_{1,0} \cap \partial D_0$ where $\partial D_0$ is a cycle associated to some $c_0 \in UN_1$.
By the cycle rule and Lemma 3.20, $\partial D_0$ contains at least one real special point other than 0. As $|S_{1,0}| = 1$ (and $0 \in S_{1,0}$) these special points can only be elements of $S_{0,1}$. There exists only one special point other than 0 in the interval $]0, c_0[$. Indeed, otherwise $\partial D_0$ would contain 3 elements of $S_{0,1} \cup S_{1,0}$ which implies $2|UN_1| < |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 1$ (by Lemma 3.22), and thus $N < \deg P + \deg Q + 3$. Now using Remark 3.6, we get that $c_0$ is not a positive useful critical point, but this contradicts the fact that $c_0 \in UN_1$.

• Assume that $|S_{1,0}| = 2$, then we have $N \leq \deg P + \deg Q + 3$. We assume that $N = \deg P + \deg Q + 3$ and prove that this gives a contradiction. The latter assumption (as discussed in the case $|S_{1,0}| = 0$) means that $|S_0|$ is even and $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}|$ since the inequality in (3.3) becomes an equality.

We now show that 0 and 1 are elements of $S_{1,0}$. Assume the contrary, say $0 \notin S_{1,0}$. Then as discussed before (case $|S_{1,0}| = 0$), Lemma 3.15 implies that there exists at least one element of $S_{0,1}$ that is not contained in a cycle associated to some $c \in UN_1$. Therefore by Lemma 3.22, we get $2|UN_1| = |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}| - 1$, a contradiction.

Therefore, the point 0 (resp. 1) belongs to a cycle associated to an element $c_0$ (resp. $c_1$) in $UN_1$. Lemma 3.22 shows that both cycles contain at most one element of $S_{0,1}$ each, since otherwise $2|UN_1| < |S_{0,1}| + |S_{1,0}|$. However, as discussed before (using Remark 3.6), this implies that $c_0$ and $c_1$ are not positive useful critical points, a contradiction.

## 4. The Case of Two Trinomials: Proof of Theorem 1.3

It is shown in [11] that the maximal number of positive solutions of a system of two trinomial equations in two variables is five. In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. We recall the proof of Theorem 1.1 in this special case in order to describe what happens in terms of the dessin d'enfant $\Gamma$ when the maximal number five of positive solutions is reached. Consider a system

$$c_0 \cdot u^{w_0} + c_1 \cdot u^{w_1} + c_2 \cdot u^{w_2} = c_3 \cdot u^{w_3} + c_4 \cdot u^{w_4} + c_5 \cdot u^{w_5} = 0 \tag{4.1}$$

where all $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^*$ , $u = (u_1, u_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and all $w_i \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. In what follows, we assume that the support of each equation of (4.1) is non-degenerate i.e. it is not contained in a line. Furthermore, we suppose that the system has positive solutions, thus the coefficients of each equation of (4.1) have different signs. Therefore without loss of generality, let $c_0 = -1$, $c_1 \cdot c_2 < 0$, $c_5 = -1$, $c_3 > 0$ and $c_4 > 0$.

Since we are looking for solutions of (4.1) with non-zero coordinates, one can assume that $w_0 = w_5 = (0, 0)$. Let $k_3$ be the greatest common divisor of the coordinates of $w_3$. Setting $z = c_3 \cdot u^{\frac{w_3}{k_3}}$ and choosing any basis of $\mathbb{Z}^2$ with first vector $\frac{1}{k_3} \cdot w_3$, we get a monomial change of coordinates $(u_1, u_2) \mapsto (z, w)$ of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^2$ such that $c_3 \cdot u^{w_3} = z^{k_3}$ and $c_4 \cdot u^{w_4} = z^{k_4} w^{l_4}$. Replacing $w$ by $w^{-1}$ if necessary, we assume that $l_4 > 0$. Indeed, $l_4 \neq 0$, since by assumption, the support of each equation of (4.1) is non-degenerate. With respect to these new coordinates, the system (4.1) becomes the polynomial system

$$-1 + a_1 \cdot z^{k_1} w^{l_1} + a_2 \cdot z^{k_2} w^{l_2} = -1 + z^{k_3} + z^{k_4} w^{l_4} = 0 \tag{4.2}$$

where $a_i$ has the same sign of $c_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Note that since $c_3$ and $c_4$ are positive, (4.1) and (4.2) have the same number of positive solutions.

We now look for the positive solutions of (4.2). The second equation of this system may be written as $w = x^\alpha (1 - x)^\beta$, where $x := z^{k_3}$, $\alpha = -k_4/(k_3 l_4)$ and $\beta = 1/l_4$. It is clear that since $z, w > 0$, we have $x \in I_0 = ]0, 1[$. Plugging $z$ and $w$ in the first equation of 4.2, we get

$$-1 + a_1 \cdot x^{\alpha_1} (1 - x)^{\beta_1} + a_2 \cdot x^{\alpha_2} (1 - x)^{\beta_2} = 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where $\alpha_i := \dfrac{k_i l_4 - k_4 l_i}{k_3 l_4}$ and $\beta_i := \dfrac{l_i}{l_4}$ for $i = 1, 2$. The number of positive solutions of (4.1) is equal to the number of solutions of (4.3) in $I_0$. Therefore we want to bound the number of solutions in $I_0$ of $f(x) = 1$ where

$$f(x) := a_1 \cdot x^{\alpha_1} (1 - x)^{\beta_1} + a_2 \cdot x^{\alpha_2} (1 - x)^{\beta_2}. \tag{4.4}$$

Note that the function $f$ has no poles in $I_0$, thus by Rolle's theorem we have $\sharp\{x \in I_0 \mid f(x) = 1\} \leq \sharp\{x \in I_0 \mid f'(x) = 0\} + 1$. Since

$$f'(x) = a_1 x^{\alpha_1 - 1} (1 - x)^{\beta_1 - 1} \rho_1(x) + a_2 x^{\alpha_2 - 1} (1 - x)^{\beta_2 - 1} \rho_2(x),$$

where $\rho_i(x) = \alpha_i - (\alpha_i + \beta_i)x$ for $i = 1, 2$, we get $f'(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi(x) = 1$, where

$$\phi(x) = -\frac{a_1}{a_2} \cdot \frac{x^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2} (1 - x)^{\beta_1 - \beta_2} \rho_1(x)}{\rho_2(x)}.$$

Thus applying Theorem 1.2 (with $\deg \rho_1 = \deg \rho_2 = 1$) we get $\sharp\{x \in I_0 \mid f'(x) = 0\} \leq 4$, and therefore $\mathcal{S}(3,3) \leq 5$.

We now start the proof of Theorem 1.3. The property that $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate is preserved under monomial change of coordinates. Thus it suffices to prove Theorem 1.3 for the system (4.2). As we just saw before, if (4.2) has five positive solutions, then $\phi(x) = 1$ has four solutions in $I_0$. We look for necessary conditions on the dessin d'enfant $\Gamma = (\phi^m)^{-1}(\mathbb{R}P^1)$ (where $m$ is a natural integer such that $\varphi = \phi^m$ is a rational function as in the previous section). More precisely, we want to know the positions of the root $\tilde{p} = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$ and the pole $\tilde{q} = \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2}$ of $\varphi$ relatively to 0 and 1 in $\mathbb{R}P^1$.

The **normal fan** of a $n$-dimensional convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is the complete fan with one-dimensional cones directed by the outward normal vectors of the $(n-1)$-faces of this polytope. Denote by $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ the Newton polytopes of the first and the second equation of (4.2) respectively.

**Definition 4.1.** *Let $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ be two 2-dimensional polygons in $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the same number of edges. In other words, their respective normal fans $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ have the same numbers of 1-cones and 2-cones respectively. We say that $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ **alternate** if every 2-cone of $\mathcal{F}_2$ contains properly a 1-cone of $\mathcal{F}_1$ (properly means that the origin is the only common face), see Figure 21.*



FIGURE 21. Two polytopes that alternate.

Another example that illustrates Theorem 1.3 (where $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate) is the system

$$x^5 - (49/95)x^3y + y^6 = y^5 - (49/95)xy^3 + x^6 = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

taken from [14] that has five positive solutions.



FIGURE 22. The Newton polytopes, their Minkowski sum and the associated normal fans of (4.5).

Recall that $k_3 > 0$ and $l_4 > 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}_2$) denote the normal fan of $\Delta_1$ (resp. $\Delta_2$). The polygon $\Delta_2$ together with $\mathcal{F}_2$ are represented in Figure 23. The outward normal vectors of the three edges of $\Delta_2$ are the vectors $F_{0,3} = (0, -k_3)$, $F_{0,4} = (-l_4, k_4)$ and $F_{3,4} = (l_4, k_3 - k_4)$. The one-dimensional cones of $\mathcal{F}_1$ are generated by vectors $F_{0,1} = \epsilon_{01}(-l_1, k_1)$, $F_{0,2} = \epsilon_{02}(-l_2, k_2)$ and $F_{1,2} = \epsilon_{12}(l_1 - l_2, k_2 - k_1)$, where $\epsilon_{ij} \in \{\pm 1\}$.




FIGURE 23. $\Delta_2$ and its normal fan $\mathcal{F}_2$.

Recall that $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ (resp. $\beta_1$ and $\beta_2$) are the powers of $x$ (resp. $1 - x$) appearing in (4.3).

**Lemma 4.2.** *If* (4.2) *has five positive solutions, then we have the following conditions*

$$\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 \neq \beta_2 - \beta_1,\ \alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2,\ \beta_1 \neq \beta_2,\ \alpha_i + \beta_i \neq 0,\ \alpha_i \neq 0 \text{ and } \beta_i \neq 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2.$$

*Proof.* It is proved in Sec.1, Cor.1 of [11] that if (4.2) has five positive solutions, then the Minkowski sum of $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ is an hexagon. Consequently, consider any two normal vectors of $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ each, if they are colinear (therefore the Minkowski sum of $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ is *not* an hexagon), then (4.2) has strictly less than five positive solutions. We now proceed by contradiction.

Assume that $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 = \beta_2 - \beta_1$. Then we have

$$\frac{k_1l_4 - k_4l_1 - k_2l_4 + k_4l_2}{k_3l_4} = \frac{k_3l_2 - k_3l_1}{k_3l_4} \;\Rightarrow\; (l_1 - l_2)(k_3 - k_4) + l_4(k_1 - k_2) = 0,$$

thus the wedge product $F_{3,4} \wedge F_{1,2}$ vanishes, a contradiction. Similarly, if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$ (resp. $\beta_1 = \beta_2$), then we get

$$\frac{k_1l_4 - k_4l_1}{k_3l_4} = \frac{k_2l_4 - k_4l_2}{k_3l_4} \;\Rightarrow\; k_4(l_2 - l_1) - l_4(k_2 - k_1) = 0$$

(resp. $k_3(l_1 - l_2) = 0$) and thus $F_{0,4} \wedge F_{1,2} = 0$ (resp. $F_{0,3} \wedge F_{1,2} = 0$), a contradiction. Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$. Using the same arguments, if $\alpha_i = 0$, $\beta_i = 0$ or $\alpha_i = -\beta_i$, we get

$$k_il_4 - k_4l_i = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; F_{0,4} \wedge F_{0,i} = 0,$$

$$l_i = 0 \;\Rightarrow\; F_{0,3} \wedge F_{0,i} = 0 \quad \text{or}$$

$$\frac{k_il_4 - k_4l_i}{k_3l_4} = \frac{k_3l_i}{k_3l_4} \;\Rightarrow\; k_il_4 - l_i(k_4 - k_3) = 0 \Rightarrow F_{3,4} \wedge F_{0,i} = 0$$

respectively, and in each of these cases this is a contradiction. □

**Corollary 4.3.** *If* (4.2) *has five positive solutions, then 0 (resp. 1, $\infty$) is a special point of $\varphi$ and $\tilde{p}$ (resp. $\tilde{q}$) does not belong to $\{0, 1, \infty\}$.*

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$ considering $\varphi^{-1}$ instead of $\varphi$ if necessary. The following key result will play an important role in relating the arrangment of the special points of $\varphi$ and the faces of $\Delta_1 + \Delta_2$.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Assume that $\sharp\{x \in I_0 |\ \phi(x) = 1\} = 4$. If $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, then*

$$\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \beta_1} < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2 + \beta_2} < 0 \quad \textit{or} \quad 1 < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2 + \beta_2} < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \beta_1}.$$

*And if $\beta_1 < \beta_2$, then*

$$0 < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2 + \beta_2} < 1 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \beta_1} \quad \textit{or} \quad \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2 + \beta_2} < 0 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1 + \beta_1} < 1.$$

Before giving the proof of Proposition 4.4, we need an intermediate result. Assume that $\phi(x) = 1$ has four solutions in $I_0$ and consider the open interval $\tilde{I}$ with endpoints $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$. Recall that we have $a_1 \cdot a_2 < 0$. Therefore the sign of $\phi(x)$ in $I_0$ is the same as that of

$$\frac{\rho_1(x)}{\rho_2(x)}.$$

Thus the solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ are either all inside or outside $\tilde{I}$. Indeed, the sign of $\phi$ changes when passing through $\tilde{p}$ (resp. $\tilde{q}$). Note that $\tilde{p} \neq \tilde{q}$, because otherwise we get $\phi(x) = kx^{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}(1-x)^{\beta_1 - \beta_2}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{R}$, which would imply that the equation $\varphi = \phi^m(x) = 1$ has at most two solutions in $I_0$.

**Lemma 4.5.** *We have $\tilde{I} \nsubseteq I_0$ and $I_0 \nsubseteq \tilde{I}$.*

*Proof.* We argue by contradiction. First, assume that $\tilde{I} \subset I_0$. Denote by $J_0$ (resp. $J_1$) the left (resp. right) connected component of $I_0 \setminus \tilde{I}$. Three cases exist.

(1) Assume that all four solutions (letter $r$) of $\varphi(x) = 1$ are contained in $\tilde{I}$. Then by Rolle's theorem, there exists at least three non-special critical points of $\varphi$ in $\tilde{I}$. Recall that $\varphi$ has at most three non-special critical points, this means that all non-special critical points of $\varphi$ are contained in $\tilde{I}$. Furthermore, we have $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$, so 0 is a root (letter $p$) of $\varphi$, and thus $\tilde{q} < \tilde{p}$, which implies that 1 is a pole (letter $q$) of $\varphi$. In this case, if $\infty$ is a root (resp. pole ) of $\varphi$ (recall that by Corollary 4.3, $\infty$ is either a root or a pole of $\varphi$), then there exists a non-special critical point that is smaller than 0 (resp. bigger than 1). This gives a contradiction.

(2) Assume that the four solutions of $\varphi(x) = 1$ in $I_0$ belong to $J_0$ (the case where the roots are in $J_1$ is symmetric). Then by Rolle's theorem, all non-special critical points of $\varphi$ (recall that it has at most three non-special critical points) are contained in $J_0$. As a consequence of Lemma 3.15, we get that none of these non-special critical points can be neighbors to the special point 0 or 1. Moreover, by Lemma 3.11, these non-special critical points cannot be neighbors to $\tilde{p}$ or $\tilde{q}$. The cycle rule shows that the non-special critical points in $J_0$ cannot be neighbors to each other. We conclude that the only possible neighbor of each non-special critical point in $J_0$ is the point $\infty$. This contradicts the cycle rule.

(3) Assume that at least one solution of $\varphi(x) = \phi^m(x) = 1$ is contained in $J_0$ and at least another one is contained in $J_1$. Thus, in particular all four solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ belong to $J_0 \cup J_1$ (since they are all either inside or outside $\tilde{I}$). Then by Rolle's theorem, there exist at least two non-special critical points of $\varphi$ contained in $J_0 \cup J_1$. Therefore, the interval $\tilde{I}$ does not contain non-special critical points since $\tilde{I}$ can only contain an even number of non-special critical points. As a consequence of Lemma 3.15, these non-special critical points cannot be neighbors to special points 0 or 1, and by Lemma 3.11, they cannot be neighbors to $\tilde{p}$ or $\tilde{q}$.

We now prove that non-special critical points in $J_0 \cup J_1$ cannot be neighbors. Indeed, assume on the contrary, that there exists a non-special critical point $c \in I_0$ that is a neighbor to a non-special critical point $\tilde{c} \in I_0$. Then both $c$ and $\tilde{c}$ cannot be contained in the same interval $J_0$ or $J_1$, otherwise this will contradict the cycle rule. Assume without loss of generality that $c \in J_0$ and $\tilde{c} \in J_1$. Recall that $\varphi$ has at most three non-special critical points in $I_0$. By Proposition 3.9, among $c$ and $\tilde{c}$, one of them, say $c$, is not useful. We show that $c$ is the only non-special critical point of $\varphi$ contained in $J_0$. Assume that there exists a non-special critical point in $J_0$ other than $c$. Then, as $c$ is not useful, $J_0$ will contain at most one letter $r$. Moreover, $\tilde{c}$ is the only non-special critical point in $J_1$, and thus $J_1$ contains at most two solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$. Therefore the total number of solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $J_0 \cup J_1$, and thus in $I_0$, can be at most three, a contradiction. We have proved that $c$ is the only non-special critical point of $\varphi$ contained in $J_0$.
Note that as $J_0$ contains only one non-special critical point, which is not useful, we have that $J_0$ does not contain solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$. Finally, since $J_1$ has at most two non-special critical points, it has at most three solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$. As before, we get that $\phi(x) = 1$ has at most three solutions in $I_0$, a contradiction. We have finished to prove that non-special critical points in $J_0 \cup J_1$ cannot be neighbors.

We now prove that non-special critical points in $J_0 \cup J_1$ cannot be neighbors to non-special critical points outside $I_0$. Arguing by contradiction, assume that there exists a non-special critical point $c_0 \in J_0 \cup J_1$ that is a neighbor to a non-special critical point

$c_1 \notin I_0$. Then, as $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$ are inside $I_0$, the number of special critical points in the open interval $K$, with endpoints $c_0$ and $c_1$, contains an odd number of special points among 0, $\tilde{p}$, $\tilde{q}$ and 1. Note that there do not exist non-special critical points in $K \setminus I_0$. Indeed, otherwise $c_0$ would be the only non-special critical point of $\varphi$ in $I_0$, which would contradict the fact that $\phi(x) = 1$ has four solutions in $I_0$. Also there is no non-special critical points in $K \cap I_0$. Indeed, otherwise there would be only one such point in $K \cap I_0$, which obviously is not a neighbor of $c_0$ or $c_1$. Moreover, this non-special critical point in $K \cap I_0$ is not a neighbor to $\tilde{p}$ or $\tilde{q}$ by Lemma 3.11, and not a neighbor to 0 or 1 by Lemma 3.15. This shows that there cannot be a non-special critical point $K \cap I_0$.
The odd number of special points in $K$ cannot be equal to one since this would contradict the cycle rule. Thus this number is equal to three. Consider the closed disc $\mathfrak{D}$ in $\mathbb{C}P^1$ with boundary given by the union of $K$ and a complex arc of $\Gamma$ joining $c_0$ to $c_1$. Note that $K$ contains either two roots and one pole of $\varphi$, or two poles and one root of $\varphi$. Moreover, $K$ does not contain non-special critical points of $\varphi$. It follows that the cycle rule is violated inside $\mathfrak{D}$.

To sum up, there are at least two non-special critical points in $J_0 \cup J_1$. We showed that they are not neighbors to 0, 1, $\tilde{p}$, $\tilde{q}$ or other non-special critical points. Moreover, it is obvious that they cannot be all neighbors to $\infty$ by the cycle rule, thus we get a contradiction.

We have finished to prove that $\tilde{I} \not\subseteq I_0$, and now we prove that $I_0 \not\subseteq \tilde{I}$. Assume on the contrary that $I_0 \subset \tilde{I}$. We have 4 solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $I_0$, so by Rolle's theorem, all three non-special critical points of $\phi$ are in $I_0$. This implies that $\tilde{q} < 0$ and $\tilde{p} > 1$. Indeed, 0 is a root of $\phi$ (since $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$), and there is no non-special critical points in $\tilde{I} \setminus I_0$. Recall that by Corollary 4.3, the value $\infty$ is either a root or a pole of $\varphi$. If $\infty$ is a root (resp. pole) of $\varphi$, then by Rolle's theorem, there should be a non-special critical point between $\tilde{p}$ (or $\tilde{q}$) and $\infty$, a contradiction. □

4.1. **Proof of Proposition 4.4.** By Lemma 4.5, we either have that $I_0 \cap \tilde{I} = \emptyset$ or that only one endpoint of $\tilde{I}$ is contained in $I_0$.

Assume first that only one endpoint $\tilde{e}$ of $\tilde{I}$ belongs to $I_0$. We already saw that the four solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $I_0$ are all either inside or outside $\tilde{I}$. Therefore these four solutions, and thus all three non-special critical points of $\varphi$, are all either bigger or smaller than $\tilde{e}$. Recall that 0 is a root of $\varphi$.

- Assume that all four solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ are bigger than $\tilde{e}$. Then, as shown at the top of Figure 24, $\tilde{e}$ is equal to $\tilde{q}$, and thus $\tilde{p}$ belongs to $]1, \infty[$, since otherwise this would give a non-special critical point smaller than $\tilde{e}$. It follows that 1 is a pole of $\varphi$, which means that $\beta_1 < \beta_2$. Moreover, we get that $0 < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < 1 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$.

- Assume now that all four solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ are smaller than $\tilde{e}$. Then, as shown at the bottom of Figure 24, $\tilde{e}$ is equal to $\tilde{p}$, and thus $\tilde{q}$ belongs to $]\infty, 0[$, since otherwise this would give a non-special critical point bigger than $\tilde{e}$. It follows again that 1 is a pole of $\varphi$, which means that $\beta_1 < \beta_2$. Moreover, we get that $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < 0 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < 1$.




FIGURE 24. At the top: $0 < \tilde{q} < 1 < \tilde{p}$. At the bottom: $\tilde{q} < 0 < \tilde{p} < 1$

Assume now that $\tilde{I} \cap I_0 = \emptyset$. Recall that by Rolle's theorem, all three non-special critical points of $\varphi$ are contained in $I_0$.

- Assume that both $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$ are negative. Since 0 is a root of $\varphi$, we have $\tilde{p} < \tilde{q} < 0$ i.e. $\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < 0$. Therefore 1 is a root of $\varphi$, which means $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ (See top of Figure 25).

- Assume that both $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$ are bigger than 1. Since 0 is a root of $\varphi$, we have that $\infty$ is a pole, and thus $1 < \tilde{q} < \tilde{p}$, i.e. $1 < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$. Therefore 1 is a root of $\varphi$, which means that $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ (See bottom of Figure 25).




FIGURE 25. At the top: $\tilde{p} < \tilde{q} < 0$. At the bottom: $1 < \tilde{q} < \tilde{p}$

4.2. **End of proof of Theorem 1.3.** Assume that $\phi(x) = 1$ has 4 solutions in $I_0$. We prove that $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate by looking at each of the four cases of conditions presented in Proposition 4.4. We prove that in each case, there exists a 2-cone $A_i$ of the fan $\mathcal{F}_2$, that does

not contain any 1-cone of $\mathcal{F}_1$. In order to do that, we look at the signs of the wedge products of the generators of the 1-cones of $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$.

Recall that

$$\tilde{p} = \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}, \quad \tilde{q} = \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2}, \ \alpha_1 > \alpha_2, \quad \text{and} \quad k_3, l_4 > 0,$$

and for $i = 1, 2$, we have

$$\alpha_i = \frac{k_i l_4 - k_4 l_i}{k_3 l_4} \ \text{ and } \ \beta_i := \frac{l_i}{l_4}. \tag{4.6}$$

• Assume that $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ and $0 < \tilde{q} < 1 < \tilde{p}$. From the proof of Proposition 4.4, we know that the roots of $\phi(x) = 1$ are inside $]\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}[$, thus $(\alpha_1+\beta_1)(\alpha_2+\beta_2) < 0$ since $\rho_i(x) = \alpha_i - (\alpha_i+\beta_i)x$ for $i = 1, 2$.
The fact that both $\tilde{p}$ and $\tilde{q}$ are positive implies that $\alpha_1(\alpha_1+\beta_1) > 0$ and $\alpha_2(\alpha_2+\beta_2) > 0$. Consequently, we have $\alpha_1\alpha_2 < 0$. Furthermore, as $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$, we have $\alpha_2 < 0 < \alpha_1$. From $\alpha_2 < 0$ and $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} > 0$, we get $\alpha_2+\beta_2 < 0$ and thus $\alpha_2+\beta_2 < 0 < \alpha_1+\beta_1$. Furthermore, as $\alpha_2+\beta_2 < 0$ (resp. $\alpha_1+\beta_1 > 0$) and $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < 1$ (resp. $1 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$), we get $\beta_2 < 0$ (resp. $\beta_1 < 0$). We have $\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2} < 0 < \frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2}$, $\alpha_2 < 0$ and $\beta_2 < 0$, therefore $\alpha_1\beta_2 < \alpha_2\beta_1$.

The last inequality gives $k_1 l_2 < k_2 l_1$, and thus $F_{0,1} \wedge F_{0,2} < 0$. Moreover, from (4.6), we have $l_1 < 0$, $l_2 < 0$ and $l_1 - l_2 < 0$. We deduce that the first coordinate of $F_{0,1}$ (resp. $F_{0,2}$, $F_{1,2}$) is positive (resp. negative, negative). Therefore $F_{0,1} = (-l_1, k_1)$, $F_{0,2} = (l_2, -k_2)$ and $F_{1,2} = (l_1 - l_2, k_2 - k_1)$. Recall that $F_{0,3} = (0, -k_3)$, $F_{0,4} = (-l_4, k_4)$ and $F_{3,4} = (l_4, k_3 - k_4)$. We have the following.

- $F_{0,3} \wedge F_{1,2} = k_3 l_4(\beta_1 - \beta_2) = k_3(l_1 - l_2) < 0$, thus $F_{1,2} \notin A_3$.
- $F_{3,4} \wedge F_{0,1} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_1+\beta_1) = k_1 l_4 - (k_4 - k_3)l_1 > 0$, thus $F_{0,1} \notin A_3$.
- $F_{0,2} \wedge F_{3,4} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_2+\beta_2) = k_2 l_4 - (k_4 - k_3)l_2 < 0$, thus $F_{0,2} \notin A_3$.

We conclude that the 2-cone $A_3$ does not contain any 1-cone of $\mathcal{F}_1$, and therefore $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate.

• Assume that $\beta_1 < \beta_2$ and $\tilde{q} < 0 < \tilde{p} < 1$. From the proof of Proposition 4.4, we know that the solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ are inside $]\tilde{q}, \tilde{p}[$, thus $(\alpha_1+\beta_1)(\alpha_2+\beta_2) < 0$ since $\rho_i(x) = \alpha_i - (\alpha_i+\beta_i)x$ for $i = 1, 2$. The fact that $\tilde{p} > 0$ and $\tilde{q} < 0$ implies that $\alpha_1(\alpha_1+\beta_1) > 0$ and $\alpha_2(\alpha_2+\beta_2) < 0$. Consequently, we have $\alpha_1\alpha_2 > 0$. Moreover, we have $\alpha_2 < 0$. Indeed, assume on the contrary, that we have $\alpha_2 > 0$. Then $\alpha_1 > 0$, $\alpha_2+\beta_2 < 0$ and $\alpha_1+\beta_1 > 0$. Recall that $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < 1$ (resp. $\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < 1$), thus $\beta_2 < 0$ (resp. $\beta_1 > 0$), which contradicts $\beta_1 < \beta_2$.
Therefore we have $\alpha_1 < 0$, $\alpha_2+\beta_2 > 0$, $\alpha_1+\beta_1 < 0$ and thus $\alpha_1+\beta_1 < \alpha_2+\beta_2$. From $\alpha_2+\beta_2 > 0$ (resp. $\alpha_1+\beta_1 < 0$) and $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < 1$ (resp. $\frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < 1$), we get $\beta_2 > 0$ (resp. $\beta_1 < 0$). We have $\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_2} < 0 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_2}$, $\alpha_2 < 0$ and $\beta_2 > 0$, thus $\alpha_1\beta_2 < \alpha_2\beta_1$.

The last inequality gives $k_1 l_2 < k_2 l_1$, and thus $F_{0,1} \wedge F_{0,2} < 0$. Moreover, from (4.6), we have $l_1 < 0$ and $0 < l_2$. We deduce that the first coordinate of $F_{0,1}$ (resp. $F_{0,2}$, $F_{1,2}$) is positive (resp. positive, negative), therefore $F_{0,1} = (-l_1, k_1)$, $F_{0,2} = (l_2, -k_2)$ and $F_{1,2} = (l_1 - l_2, k_2 - k_1)$.

Therefore we have the following.

- $F_{0,4} \wedge F_{1,2} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) = k_4(l_2 - l_1) - l_4(k_2 - k_1) > 0$, thus $F_{1,2} \notin A_4$.
- $F_{3,4} \wedge F_{0,1} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) = k_1 l_4 - (k_4 - k_3) l_1 < 0$, thus $F_{0,1} \notin A_4$.
- $F_{0,2} \wedge F_{3,4} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_2 + \beta_2) = k_2 l_4 - (k_4 - k_3) l_2 > 0$, thus $F_{0,2} \notin A_4$.

We conclude that the 2-cone $A_4$ does not contain any 1-cone of $\mathcal{F}_1$, therefore $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate.

• Assume that $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ and $\tilde{p} < \tilde{q} < 0$. From the proof of Proposition 4.4, we know that the solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $I_0$ are outside $]\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}[$, thus $(\alpha_1+\beta_1)(\alpha_2+\beta_2) > 0$ since $\rho_i(x) = \alpha_i - (\alpha_i+\beta_i)x$ for $i = 1, 2$. We have that both of $\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{p}$ are negative, thus $\alpha_2(\alpha_2+\beta_2) < 0$ and $\alpha_1(\alpha_1+\beta_1) < 0$, and consequently we get $\alpha_1\alpha_2 > 0$. Recall that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, therefore $\alpha_1+\beta_1 > \alpha_2+\beta_2$. Moreover, we have $\frac{1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < \frac{1}{\alpha_2+\beta_2}$ since $(\alpha_1+\beta_1)(\alpha_2+\beta_2) > 0$. We have $\beta_1 < 0$. Indeed, assume on the contrary that $\beta_1 > 0$. Then $\alpha_1(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) < 0$ gives $\alpha_1 < 0$, and thus $\alpha_2 < 0$. Therefore we get $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1 < 0$ and consequently $0 < \frac{1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < \frac{1}{\alpha_2+\beta_2}$ gives $\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$, which is a contradiction with $\tilde{p} < \tilde{q}$.
Then $\beta_2 < \beta_1 < 0$, and $\alpha_1(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) < 0$ (resp. $\alpha_2(\alpha_2 + \beta_2) < 0$) gives $\alpha_1 > 0$ (resp. $\alpha_2 > 0$) and $(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) < 0$ (resp. $(\alpha_2 + \beta_2) < 0$).
Having $\alpha_2 < \alpha_1$ and $\beta_2 < 0$ (resp. $\alpha_2 > 0$ and $\beta_2 < \beta_1$) gives $\alpha_1\beta_2 < \alpha_2\beta_2$ (resp. $\alpha_2\beta_2 < \alpha_2\beta_1$) and therefore $\alpha_1\beta_2 < \alpha_2\beta_1$.

The last inequality gives $k_1 l_2 < k_2 l_1$, and thus $F_{0,1} \wedge F_{0,2} < 0$. Moreover, from (4.6), we have $l_2 < l_1 < 0$. We deduce that the first coordinate of $F_{0,1}$ (resp. $F_{0,2}$, $F_{1,2}$) is positive (resp. negative, positive), therefore $F_{0,1} = (-l_1, k_1)$, $F_{0,2} = (l_2, -k_2)$ and $F_{1,2} = (l_1 - l_2, k_2 - k_1)$. Therefore we have the following.

- $F_{0,4} \wedge F_{0,2} = k_3 l_4 \alpha_2 = l_4 k_2 - k_4 l_2 > 0$, thus $F_{0,2} \notin A_4$.
- $F_{3,4} \wedge F_{0,1} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) = k_1 l_4 - (k_4 - k_3) l_1 < 0$, thus $F_{0,1} \notin A_4$.
- $F_{0,4} \wedge F_{1,2} = k_3 l_4(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) = k_4(l_2 - l_1) - l_4(k_2 - k_1) > 0$, thus $F_{1,2} \notin A_4$.

We conclude that the 2-cone $A_4$ does not contain any 1-cone of $\mathcal{F}_1$, therefore $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate.

• Assume that $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ and $1 < \tilde{q} < \tilde{p}$. From the proof of Proposition 4.4, we know that the solutions of $\phi(x) = 1$ in $I_0$ are outside $]\tilde{p}, \tilde{q}[$, thus we have $(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) \cdot (\alpha_2 + \beta_2) > 0$ since $\rho_i(x) = \alpha_i - (\alpha_i+\beta_i)x$ for $i = 1, 2$. Both of $\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{p}$ are positive, thus we get $\alpha_2(\alpha_2+\beta_2) > 0$ and $\alpha_1(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) > 0$. Consequently, we get that $\alpha_1\alpha_2$ is positive. Recall that $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 > \beta_2$, therefore $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 > \alpha_2 + \beta_2$, and thus $\frac{1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1} < \frac{1}{\alpha_2+\beta_2}$ since $(\alpha_1 + \beta_1) \cdot (\alpha_2 + \beta_2) > 0$. We have $\beta_1 > 0$. Indeed, assume on the contrary, that $\beta_1 < 0$ (and thus $\beta_2 < 0$ since $\beta_2 < \beta_1$). Then $1 < \alpha_1/(\alpha_1 + \beta_1)$ (resp. $1 < \alpha_2/(\alpha_2 + \beta_2)$) gives $\alpha_1 > 0$ (resp. $\alpha_2 > 0$). Moreover, $\beta_2 < \beta_1 < 0$ (resp. $0 < \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2} < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$ ) yields $\alpha_1\beta_2 < \alpha_2\beta_1$ (resp. $\alpha_2\beta_1 < \alpha_1\beta_2$), and thus a contradiction.
Since $1 < \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_1+\beta_1}$ and $\beta_1 > 0$, we get $\alpha_1 < 0$, and thus $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 < 0$. Furthermore, this gives

$\alpha_2+\beta_2<0$ since $(\alpha_1+\beta_1)(\alpha_2+\beta_2)>0$, and consequently $\alpha_2(\alpha_2+\beta_2)>0$ yields $\alpha_2<0$. We have $\beta_2>0$ since $1<\frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_2+\beta_2}$, and therefore we get $\alpha_1\beta_2>\alpha_2\beta_1$ since $0<\beta_2<\beta_1$ and $\alpha_2<\alpha_1<0$.

The inequality $\alpha_1\beta_2>\alpha_2\beta_1$ gives $k_1l_2>k_2l_1$, and thus $F_{0,1}\wedge F_{0,2}>0$. Moreover, from (4.6), we have $0<l_2<l_1$. With these relations we deduce that the first component of $F_{0,1}$ (resp. $F_{0,2}$, $F_{1,2}$) is positive (resp. negative, negative), therefore $F_{0,1}=(l_1,-k_1)$, $F_{0,2}=(-l_2,k_2)$ and $F_{1,2}=(l_2-l_1,k_1-k_2)$. Therefore we have the following.

- $F_{0,2}\wedge F_{0,3}=k_3l_4\beta_2=k_3l_2>0$, thus $F_{0,2}\notin A_3$.
- $F_{0,1}\wedge F_{3,4}=k_3l_4(\alpha_1+\beta_1)=k_1l_4-(k_4-k_3)l_1<0$, thus $F_{0,1}\notin A_3$.
- $F_{3,4}\wedge F_{1,2}=k_3l_4(\alpha_1+\beta_1-\alpha_2-\beta_2)=(k_4-k_3)(l_2-l_1)-l_4(k_2-k_1)>0$, thus $F_{1,2}\notin A_3$.

We conclude that the 2-cone $A_3$ does not contain any 1-cone of $\mathcal{F}_1$, therefore $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_2$ do not alternate.

## References


[1] F. Bihan, *Polynomial systems supported on circuits and dessins d'enfant*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **75** (2007), no. 1, 116–132.

[2] F. Bihan and F. Sottile, *New fewnomial upper bounds from Gale dual polynomial systems*, 2007, Moscow Mathematical Journal, Volume 7, Number 3.

[3] O. Bottema and B. Roth, *Theoretical kinematics*, Dover Publications Inc., New York, 1990, Corrected reprint of the 1979 edition.

[4] E. Brugallé, *Real plane algebraic curves with asymptotically maximal number of even ovals*, 2006, Duke Mathematical Journal 131 (3):575–587.

[5] C. I. Byrnes, *Pole assignment by output feedback* Three decades of mathematical system theory, Lect. Notes in Control and Inform. Sci., vol. 135, Springer, Berlin, 1989, pp. 3178.

[6] A. Dickenstein, J.-M. Rojas, K. Rusek, J. Shih *Extremal real algebraic geometry and A-discriminants,* Mosc. Math. J. 7 (2007), no. 3, 425 - 452, 574.

[7] K. Gatermann and B. Huber, *A Family of Sparse Polynomial Systems Arising in Chemical Reaction Systems*, J. of Symbolic Comput. 33 (2002), part 3, 275305.

[8] B. Haas, *A simple counterexample to Kouchnirenko's conjecture*, Beiträge Algebra Geom. 43 (2002), no. 1, 18.

[9] A. Khovanskii, *Fewnomials*, Trans. of Math. Monographs, 88, AMS, 1991.

[10] P. Koiran, N. Portier, S. Tavenas, *A Wronskian approach to the real -conjecture*, J. Symbolic Comput. 68 (2015), part 2, 195 - 214.

[11] T.-Y. Li, J.-M. Rojas and X. Wang, *Counting real connected components of trinomial curve intersections and m-nomial hypersurfaces,* Discrete Comput. Geom. 30 (2003), no. 3, 379 - 414.

[12] S. Mueller, E. Feliu, G. Regensburger, C. Conradi, A. Shiu, A. Dickenstein, *Sign conditions for injectivity of generalized polynomial maps with applications to chemical reaction networks and real algebraic geometry*, Foundations of Computational Mathematics (2015), pp 1-29.

[13] S. Yu Orevkov, *Riemann existence theorem and construction of real algebraic curves*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **12** (2003), no. 4, 517–531.

[14] J.-M. Rojas, *Personal Communication*, e-mailed from Texas A&M University, Texas.

[15] F. Sottile, *Real Solutions to Equations from Geometry*, University Lecture Series. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI (2011).

Laboratoire de Mathématiques, Université Savoie Mont Blanc, 73376 Le Bourget-du-Lac Cedex, France

*E-mail address*: boulos.el-hilany@univ-smb.fr